WORKSHEET 3.9

Thirty-Eight Times Medium

Subchapter 3.9 · case in the book: Whistler

If every issue in your register carries the same rating, has your hotel evaluated everything with equal care, or has it evaluated nothing? And could an auditor take a single line and show how it came to stand where it stands?

This worksheet turns the tools of the subchapter into a form you can fill in. The texts come from the book; the empty columns are for your own property. Adapt it before use: an unadapted checklist is exactly what the book warns against.

Practical application: what to do in your property

Step (from the book)	Done?	What we found / owner
A complete criteria sheet: The sheet now includes interested parties' feedback and new and emerging issues, states where research exists for an issue, and defines in one sentence what each level means.		
Numbered feedback: The eleven pieces of feedback were numbered, and each line of the register now cites the numbers that entered its rating. Feedback without a line is listed separately and reviewed monthly.		
A sentence of justification: Every line was re-rated with one sentence explaining why. A new line appeared: "Arrival and departure under natural hazards", with the agency's letter beside it. The procedure sheet now names who triggers a review after a special event, and within what time.		
Results shared: The congress agency received the lines that concern it; seasonal staff received the line on housing.		

These steps are the book's method, not requirements of ISO 20121. Evidence can take whatever form suits the property; a separate document is needed only where an applicable requirement, or the property's own system, makes it necessary.

Verification Pact: what is believed, tested against the standard

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
The auditor checks whether issues are rated correctly	No. The auditor tests the procedure under 6.1.2: criteria, application, currency, sharing; rating is the hotel's task	
Rating every issue at the same level is not allowed	No. No distribution is prescribed; ratings must rest on documented criteria (6.1.2)	
Each hotel chooses its criteria freely	Only partially true. Criteria must include feedback, emerging issues and, where applicable, research (6.1.2)	
The register is revised once a year	Only partially true. Results must be kept up to date (6.1.2); the hotel sets when	

What is commonly believed	What actually holds	Our position
A hotel that finds climate change relevant needs a line for it	Only partially true. 4.1 requires the determination; 6.1.2 names climate change as a possible issue, not exhaustively	
Without the five criteria of C.2.2 the register does not conform	No. C.2.2 is guidance; documented criteria with the elements of 6.1.2 are required	
The register is an internal working paper	No. Results must be shared with relevant interested parties (6.1.2)	

Common mistakes: a self-check

Mistake (from the book)	Present here?	Action / owner
Setting everything to medium so that nothing is overlooked, and distinguishing nothing.		
Writing a meeting date as the justification.		
Collecting feedback without linking it to a line.		
Managing a special event and never asking what it means for the register.		
Leaving out of the register what the context paper calls relevant.		
Correcting ratings as auditor instead of testing the procedure.		
Auditing gently in a cross-audit without a rule for who receives the reports.		
Treating the register as an internal working paper that nobody outside sees.		

Operative synthesis

- **Does a procedure sheet say who keeps the register and when it is updated?: Clause 6.1.2 requires a process, not a list**
- **Does the criteria sheet include feedback, emerging issues and, where applicable, research?: These elements are required by 6.1.2**
- **Can each line show why it stands at its level?: A rating that cannot be traced cannot be audited**
- **Does each piece of feedback carry a number and a reference to a line?: Collected feedback that changes nothing has not been evaluated**
- **Was the register reviewed after the last special event?: Results must be kept up to date**
- **Do we know which interested parties received the register, and when?: Results must be shared with relevant interested parties**
- **Act on immediately. Ask for the procedure sheet, criteria sheet, feedback folder and every version of the register, and draw five lines to trace backwards.**
- **Plan for. Complete the criteria sheet, number every piece of feedback, justify each rating in a sentence, and name who reviews the register after special events.**

› **Monitor going forward. At each audit, hold the most recent special event against the register and check whether a review was recorded.**

Action plan for our property

Action	Owner	Due	How we will know it worked

Source: Francesco Dore, The Helm and the Lens, Volume 8b «The Lens», subchapter 3.9. Edizioni Effedore, 2026. Clause references are paraphrased; this sheet does not reproduce the text of ISO 20121, ISO 19011 or ISO/IEC 17021-1. It is not legal advice: the law that applies is that of the place where the property operates.